UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,783	05/24/2001	Indra Laksono	VIXS 006	8015

34280 7590 05/14/2009

TIMOTHY W. MARKISON
VIXS, INC.
P.O.BOX 160727
AUSTIN, TX 78736

EXAMINER	
BROWN, RUEBEN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2424	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/864,783	LAKSONO, INDRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REUBEN M. BROWN	2424	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 March 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *16-33 and 57-74* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-3, 10-15, 34-44, & 51-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *4-9 and 45-50* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 14, 42 & 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffner, (U.S. Pat # 6,104,908), in view of Paul, (U.S. Pat # 6,381,745).

Considering claims 1 & 42, Schaffner teaches a system wherein a local distribution system 14 , receives a plurality of media signals from a plurality of different sources and provides them as a multiplexed data stream to a plurality of dwellings 12, see Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 21-45; col. 4, lines 1-45. The local distribution system 14 receives regular VHF/UHF broadcast channels via antenna 18, as well as satellite TV channels, via dish 16. The diplexer 24, within the

local distribution system 14 receives signals from transmodulators 22 & 26, and combines them to be transmitted to the plurality of dwellings 12.

The amended claimed, *'method for isolating a channel of interest from a set of channels from a plurality of multimedia sources that include a video network in a multimedia system that includes a multimedia server that is coupled to the plurality of multimedia sources'*, reads on the disclosure of Schaffner. In particular, the user selects a desired programming from the plurality of sources that are available and the associated programming is delivered to the dwelling 12, wherein the particular channel is tuned by the diplexer 28, see col. 4, lines 32-51.

As for the additionally claimed *'local media player, such that at least one of the set of channels includes data from the local media player'*, Schaffner discloses that at least one of the sources other than the satellite signal, may be any other suitable source, (col. 3, lines 64-67) but does not explicitly cite that the source could be from a local device.

Nevertheless Paul, which is in the same field of local video distribution as Schaffner, provides a teaching of a video content from a VCR 172 being modulated and combined with a plurality of exterior signals to be transmitted to a user, see col. 4, lines 20-42; col. 5, lines 10-28. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Schaffner with the feature of providing locally stored video programming on a system, as taught by Paul, at least for the desirable of advantage of providing the user with a

wider variety of available programs, since the user may want allow multiple terminals to retrieve video programming from a single VCR, which adds to the convenience of the system.

'receiving the set of channels as a stream of data', reads on the disclosure of Schaffner that the video programming from the different sources are multiplexed together.

'interpreting segments of the stream of data to identify data of the channel of interest',; and *'interpreting the data of the channel of interest to determine the type of data'* is also met by the disclosure Ludtke which teaches that the broadcast stream attaches ID tags that identify the segments of the broadcast stream for selection by the user and collection by the passive monitoring system that tracks the ID of programs being displayed on the monitor 121, see col. 6, lines 57-67 thru col. 7, lines 1-15 & col. 8, lines 35-52 & col. 11, lines 17-65.

'processing the data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce processed data' and *'providing the processed data for display'* reads on the discussion Schaffner that the satellite channels receive further processing by the MDU-IRD 32, whereas the local TV channels, i.e. at least UHF/VHF are directly transmitted to the TV 40, see col. 4, lines 51-67.

Considering claims 14 & 55, the subject matter is met by diplexer 28 & demodulator 30of Schaffner, col. 4, lines 32-51

4. Claims 2-3, 10-13, 43-44 & 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffner & Paul, further in view of Ohishi, (U.S. Pat # 6,480,551).

Considering claims 2-3, 10-13, 43-44 & 51-54 Schaffner teaches that the receiver may determine the selected programming by recovering the desired signal, but does not discuss the details of a stream. However, Ohishi provides a discussion of streaming video programming in a local video network; see (Figs. 1-5; col.5, lines 1-15; col. 6, lines 65-67 thru col. 7, lines 1-45).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Schaffner with the technology of an MPEG type stream, for the benefit of utilizing standard digital data tables, as taught by Ohishi, col. 1, lines 11-66.

Regarding claims 10-11 & 51-52, the claimed *'application data'* subject matter is broad enough to data stored and retrieved from the VCR 172 of Paul.

Regarding claims 13 & 54, see Ohishi discusses that the particular channel chosen by the user is searched for by he system, col. 6, lines 64-67 thru col. 7, lines 1-45.

5. Claims 15 & 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaffner & Paul, further in view of Tsuge, (U.S. Pat # 5,995,709).

Considering claims 15 & 56, even though Ludtke teaches decoding a video stream, the reference does not teach specifics of at least one of: multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding of data streams. However Tsuge, which is in the same field of endeavor, provides a teaching of non-return to zero (NRZ) conversion, Abstract; col. 7, lines 41-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-21. Tsuge is particularly compatible with the Hamlin, which includes an MPEG demux 127 and decoders 129,131 (Fig. 4) for decoding an MPEG stream; since Tsuge is also directed to decoding data included in an MPEG data stream, (NRZ modulated pixel data, which may contain closed caption data), see col. 2, lines 1-25. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ludtke with the features of non-return to zero coding/decoding, at least for the desirable advantage of transmitting text code as NRZ modulated signals, as taught Tsuge, col. 1, lines 15-55.

6. Claims 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton, (U.S. Pat # 5,708,961), in view of Novak, (U.S. PG-PUB 2002/0104099)

Considering claim 34, the claimed client module for use in a multimedia system that includes a multimedia server that is coupled to a plurality of multimedia sources including a video network and the Internet, reads on the combination of Hylton & Novak, which comprises:

'a network interface controller operably coupled to receive encoded channel data that represents a set of channels via a communication path from the multimedia server, the set of channels including at least one channel for providing a user with bidirectional access to the Internet, such that the NIC extracts data relating to a channel of interest from the encoded channel data', even though Hylton discloses that video programming may be transmitted to TIM 101, the reference does not explicitly discuss that a channel carrying Internet data may also be transmitted. However, Novak provides a teaching of a home video network wherein a plurality of multimedia sources are delivered to the STB 152, including Internet data, Para [0032-0039; 0062] & Fig. 6. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of providing an Internet channel to a customer, at least for the desirable benefit of allowing the user the convenience to accessing additional information sources, as taught by Novak.

'video decoder to decode the data relating to the channel of interest to produce decoded data', is met by the operation of the video decoder 129, of Hylton, see col. 9, lines 1-25 & col. 14, lines 30-67 thru col. 15, lines 1-35; Fig. 4.

'memory operably coupled to store the decoded video data', reads on the video RAM 4 of Hylton; col. 15, lines 1-15.

'rendering module' reads on the encoder 137, (Fig. 4; col. 16, lines 8-20).

Considering claims 35-36, see col. 14, lines 20-67, Hylton, which discloses the TV 103.

Considering claim 37, the NIC reads on the TIM 101 of Hylton, see col. 8, lines 1-45.

Considering claims 38 & 39, the claimed microphone or video camera, local to the user is met by Novak, [0061].

Novak inherently includes A/D converter for converting the inputs from camera & microphone into digital signals; see col. 15, lines 30-38.

7. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton & Novak, in view of Arai, (U.S. Pat # 7,068,677).

Considering claim 40, Hylton does not teach transmitting packets in the wireless network using CSMA technology. Nevertheless, Arai is directed to a radio LAN that uses CSMA technology, Abstract; col. 2, lines 50-61. Arai goes on teach transmitting IP packets in the system and using the CSMA technology, see col. 5, lines 22-35. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the technique of CSMA for detecting LAN data, including IP data, as taught by Arai, for the benefit

of using the known reliability of CSMA over a radio LAN system, overcoming the problem using a radio LAN over long distance, see col. 1, lines 49-67 thru col. 2, lines 1-20.

8. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton & Novak, in view of Leone.

Considering claim 41, Hylton does not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and ''de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which his de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 4-9 & 45-50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Kay Teaches plurality of video channels streamed over a local network that includes local TV content.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:
(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or:
(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Reuben M. Brown/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623